3/24/71

Dear Harold (cc. Dick)

Now is a good time for me to go through your recent mailings and make response where I can. I have many things from you on hand.

Your Memphis trip sounds great. From what you sent, I got the impression that there was also a hearing for Ray, but got no indication of its outcome. Have seen nothing in papers.

Ali: Good letter--and good luck. I wonder if those numerous appeals to his manhood will draw him away from the mass of Ceasar's friends.

Your letters to Paul re Zap. and Nix do not always convey clearly what you mean to say. However, in some instances I think you are incorrect or have overstepped the limits of possible analysis.

One case is using Z313 and 314 to study dispersal and and nature of head wound. Even though the shot has occurred by 314, it is a bad frame to use to see what the head wound was like for several reasons. First, the head and esp. the brain matter was still violently moving at that point, Also, the head is sufficiently turned to the left that a good portion of the anterior part of the wound is not shown. At that point there was a good deal of brain matter still adhereing which subsequently drops off (visible in Z in a matter of seconds). Perhaps it is some of this tissue hanging over the face which confuses you about the position of the wound. I studied this all very closely at Archives when there and decided that these only frames which portray the head wound in any way close to suitable for study are those around 335, where we have a good profile of his head. I seem to reaall being able to see an oval wound. Possibly Mrs. Kennedy's hand obscures the top. The top may also be obscured by a flap of scalp, which can be very misleading. Autopsy report indicates such a flap existed.

How do the "earlier" Z frames indicate Willis might have taken another picture "close to 313"? In your second letter you speak of a study indicating Willis' reappearance in Z. Nonsense. Not only would he have had to run far west to do this (as you say), he would have had to return east again to take his sixth slide. I think the man this study refers to is Bothun who is visible w camera in Z, near Altgens.

In your first letter you say your Nix copy shows a piece of skull going <u>up</u> and back. In your second you say "the head-fragment backward is not new", omitting the "upward". You further indicate that Tink and an Italian movie both have this. Now that I know just what you are talking about (Tink prints the pix in Sic Secs) I can assure you that what you see is not a piece of skull. Everyone has missed this. It is only the reflection of Zapruder's pedestal on the trunk of the car. Let me explain so you don't misunderstand.

Reflections in cars will occur very similarly as they do in mirrors. From each different perspective, you will see a different image. Thus, what was reflected on the car from Nix's position

was unique to him, and someone in another position (e.g. Zap) would not see the same thing. The way to determine what will be reflected on the car is to look for what is directly above the car from the position of whoever's pictures you are studying. The same thing happens with images in water. Thus, if you watch the trunk in Z, everytime the car passes a spectator, you can see their reflection move across the trunk. If you look at the entire Nix film during the head shot and project a line down from Zap's pedestal, you will see that at the time of the shot, JFK's head was almost directly beneath.. In subsequent frames, the trunk passes beneath, and there is the little white reflection. This is all that you see moving across the trunk. If you watch the rest of the Nix film, you can find another "skull fragment" when the car passes under the illuminated part of the stone wall connected to the Pergola.

Because of what Tink said, I very closely checked the trunk in the Z slides at A, and found nothing visible on it. That large chunk of skull would have been visible if it were really skull.

So, there is no doubt in my mind that what you see in Nix is a perfectly explanable illusion, not a piece of skull. In publishing it, Thompson gave us another straw man.

I believe there is a very slight forward motion in Nix, for one frame--as in Z. But I think that motion can be explained by a front shot.

As for men in Nix, there is one in the corner of the stone wall--the same one you can see in Willis 5 and Betzner. He is also visible in Moorman, I believe, though not as Marcus postulates. I would be too embarrassed to publically (or privately) assert that a man in such an open position had anything to do with the shooting.

By coincidence, we'll be (or when you read this-have been) in New York at the same time, though I won't have any time to get together. Family affair.

Must go.

Best,
Howard

P.S.-to Harold only: Many thanks for the carbon of your response to gov't "Opposition" in clothing suit. The record is frighteningly consistent, and is a monument to the dishonestly and lack of integrity of this government. Should the judge ignore it, I fear the judicial branch might wind up in the same XXXXXXX boat as the executive.